REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Applicants request reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the present patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, appreciation is expressed to Examiner Hamdan for the courtesies extended to the undersigned and Mr. Schneider during the personal interview on September 5, 2003.

In response to the objections set forth at pages 2 and 3 of the Official Action, the Abstract, Specification, Drawings, and Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. In particular, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to adopt the helpful suggestions of the Examiner. The Abstract has been amended to refer to both a system and a computer program code. Figure 2 and the Specification have been amended to renumber the conversion operation previously identified with reference numeral 26 as reference numeral 37 to avoid confusion with the file 26. Figure 1 has been amended to include descriptive legends for boxes 3, 4, 10-15, and 17. Figure 1 and page 7 of the Specification have also been amended to use reference numeral 38 instead of 28 for the viewing screen to avoid confusion with the "parameter preparation" process 28 in Figure 2.

Page 2 of the Official Action observed that the boxes 2 and 8 in Figure 2 should have descriptive legends. Because boxes 2 and 8 do not appear in Figure 2, Figure 1 has been amended to include descriptive legends for the insert feeder stations 7 and 8, based on the assumption that these are the boxes which were intended to be identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objections to the Abstract, the Specification, the drawings, and Claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

The claims pending in this application are claims 1-18. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 18 are the only independent claims currently at issue. The Office Action sets forth a rejection of independent Claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) on the basis of the disclosure contained in U.S. Patent No. 4,800,505 to Axelrod et al.

During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the features of the system claimed in Claim 1 and the features of the Axelrod et al. mail preparation system. As presented during the interview, and as summarized below, Axelrod et al. does not disclose a system having all of the features of Claim 1.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for generating printed mail pieces, starting from a print file. The system includes a printer for printing postal items, a processing device for processing printed postal items into mail pieces, and a control unit for controlling the printer and the processing device. The control unit includes: an input interface for inputting a rough print file for controlling the printer; an output interface connected with the printer and with the processing device for transmitting control signals to at least the printer or the processing device for controlling the printer and the processing device in accordance with, or formed by, the processed print file; a processor for processing the rough print file in accordance with processing instructions into a processed print file; and memory. The memory contains processing code and representation code. The processing code controls the control unit for processing the rough print file into the processed

print file, and includes processing instructions. The representation code causes the processing instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form. Further, the representation code is editable for changing at least the representations of the processing instructions, and is convertible into the processing code.

A system according to claim 1 can allow more versatility in processing a rough print file into a processed print file for controlling not only a printer, but also the processing device for processing printed postal items. Moreover, the representation codes allow one to see the processing codes in humanly perceptible form, and to edit the representation codes. The edited representation codes are convertible into the processing code so that the changes made are incorporated into the processing code.

Axelrod et al. provides a modification of a mail preparation system intended to address a difficulty encountered in previous systems which use dash codes for controlling a document inserter. Because the dash codes are limited in size, and because information included in dash codes can become very large if the instructions are complex, the data processing system in Axelrod et al. strips the dash code from the print data and replaces it with an identification code printed on the document. The identification code corresponds to a record generated by the data processing system and stored in a database. The record can include information such as the address to be printed on the envelope, the dash code information for controlling the inserter, additional codes for business return envelopes, as well as the identification code itself. See column 3, lines 8-21 and column 4, lines 5-22, and Figure 3. After the documents are printed and weighed, a scanner 52 reads the

identification code information on the printout and transmits it to a computer system 60. The computer system 60 accesses the associated record stored in the database 64 and generates control signals for the inserter 80. As discussed at column 6, lines 37 - 68, the Axelrod et al. processor 62 also controls the print mechanism 86 to print machine readable code classification pointer code on an insert and controls the envelope printer 90 to print zip code information in bar code format on the item to be mailed.

Axelrod et al. does not disclose a control unit having a memory which has processing code and representation code as set forth in Claim 1. The Office Action points to the Axelrod et al. inserter 80 as corresponding to the claimed control unit. During the interview, Examiner Hamdan indicated that the Axelrod et al. processor 62 could be considered to correspond to the claimed control unit. However, neither the Axelrod et al. inserter 80 nor the processor 62 has all of the features of the control unit of Claim 1.

First, the inserter 80 does not control the document printer 20 or the envelope printer 90. Thus, the Axelrod et al. inserter 80 cannot correspond to the claimed "control unit for controlling the printer and the processing device".

The Axelrod et al. processor 62 also does not have all of the features of the claimed control unit. In particular, Axelrod et al. does not disclose that the processor 62 has a memory which includes both processing code for controlling the control unit for processing the rough print file into the processed print file, which processing code comprises processing instructions, and representation code for causing the processing instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form, with the representation code being editable for

changing at least the representations of the processing instructions, and the representation code being convertible into the processing code.

As discussed above, the processor 62 retrieves the record associated with the identification code, generates control signals for the inserter 80, controls the print mechanism 86 to print the machine readable pointer classification code on the insert, controls the printer 90 to print zip code information in bar code form on the item, and sets the postage meter 100. Nothing in Axelrod et al. indicates that that the processor 62 includes representation code in a memory of a control unit, which such representation code causing the processing instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form, while also being editable and convertible into the processing code.

Nor is there any apparent disclosure in Axelrod et al. that the processor 62 processes a rough print file, which at least partially defines a document to be printed, into a processed print file for controlling the printer and the processing device for processing the printed postal items.

Therefore, Axelrod et al. does not disclose a mail preparation system having all of the features of independent Claim 1.

Independent claim 17 is directed to a computer program code for controlling a control unit for controlling a printer and a processing device for processing printed postal items into postal sets. The computer program code includes processing code for controlling the control unit for processing a rough print file into a processed print file. The computer program code also includes representation code for causing the processing

instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form. The representation code is editable for changing at least the representations of the processing instructions. The representation code is convertible into the processing code.

As discussed above in connection with Claim 1, Axelrod et al. does not disclose representation code for causing processing instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form, with the representation code being editable for changing at least the representations of the processing instructions, and with the representation code being convertible into the processing code.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Office Action sets forth a rejection of independent Claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on the basis of the disclosure contained in Axelrod et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is requested for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 9 is directed to a system for generating printed mail pieces, starting from a print file. The system comprises a printer for printing postal items, and a processing device for processing printed postal items into mail pieces. The system also includes a control unit for controlling the printer and the processing device. The control unit includes, among other features, memory containing a set of processing subroutines. With the set of processing subroutines, representation codes are composed which cause the processing instructions to be represented in humanly perceptible form. The representation codes differ from each other at least as regards the processing instructions included therein.

The representation codes are editable for changing at least the representations of the processing instructions. Further, the representation codes are each convertible into a processing code corresponding to the respective representation code for controlling the control unit for processing the rough print file into the processed print file.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Axelrod et al. does not disclose the representation codes having the features set forth in the claims. Therefore, Axelrod et al. would not provide any guidance regarding a set of processing subroutines by which representation codes can be composed.

Accordingly, claim 9 is believed to be patentably distinct over the disclosure of Axelrod et al.

Independent Claim 18 also makes clear that the processing subroutines are for composing representation codes. Accordingly, claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 9 is allowable.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 9, 17, and 18 are allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-18 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or should the Examiner wish to discuss the application further with the undersigned, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: September 10, 2003

By: Sally A. Ferrett
Sally A. Ferrett
Registration No. 46,325

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620